

Vol. VIII No. 3

Spring 1986

**Creation
Social Science
and Humanities
QUARTERLY**



CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY

The Creation Social Science and Humanities Society (CSSHS) was incorporated in Wichita, Kansas, in 1977. The CSSHS is educational, and will promote and disseminate information on the implications of the Biblical creation model of origins for the social sciences and humanities, with emphasis on the development of these disciplines in accordance with the rapidly emerging and increasingly well established natural scientific models of Biblical creation.

The *Quarterly Journal* is directed toward teachers and students of the social sciences and humanities, especially in institutions of higher learning. The CSSHS may also publish books, monographs, and other writings, and sponsor speakers, seminars, and research projects related to its educational purpose.

IRS tax-exempt status was granted December 30, 1977. All contributions are tax-deductible.

Voting membership is initially by invitation of the Board of Directors of the CSSHS to candidates eligible on the following basis.

- a. persons with at least a baccalaureate degree in the social sciences or humanities; or
- b. persons 18 years old or over, who have held office in another creation-science organization with beliefs substantially identical with those contained in the CSSHS Statement of Belief, for at least one year immediately prior to applying for membership in the CSSHS; or who have a commitment to our belief and work clearly evidenced by their record of actual involvement. Voting membership dues are \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) per year.

Sustaining membership is open to those who subscribe to the C.S.S.H.S. Statement of Belief. Sustaining membership dues are \$12 (foreign, \$13 U.S.) per year.

Both voting and sustaining memberships include subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly**, and are reckoned as beginning and ending in September.

Non-members may subscribe to the **CSSH Quarterly** at the rate of \$14 (foreign, \$15 U.S.) per year.

Officers: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman, *President*; Mrs. Diane Powell, *Vice-President*; Mrs. Ellen Myers, *Secretary-Treasurer*.

Editor: Dr. Paul D. Ackerman

Board of References: Dr. Duane T. Gish, *San Diego, California*; Rev. Walter Lang, *Minneapolis, Minnesota*; Dr. Henry M. Morris, *San Diego, California*; Dr. Harold S. Slusher, *El Paso, Texas*; Dr. John C. Whitcomb, Jr., *Winona Lake, Indiana*; Dr. Clifford A. Wilson, *Mt. Waverly, Victoria, Australia*.

Cover art by Mrs. E. Sue Paar

ISSN 0740-3399

EDITORIAL

Dear Readers:

God is a person and not a machine, principle or force. Machines, principles and forces can be analyzed and "figured-out," then harnessed to serve the ends of man. Persons react to being dealt with in this way. God gave me a painful lesson in this truth through an experience with my earthly father in my boyhood many years ago. There was a movie in our small town I wanted to see. It was a summer evening and my parents had taken me to a baseball game. The hope was that after the game we could go to the "picture show." I made my desire known, but father was resistant. A campaign of persuasion was mounted. I wanted my own way, and worked very hard to get it. In the end father relented; we would go to the movie.

After all these years I still clearly remember the scene. I was overjoyed not only at the prospect of the show, but also in getting my own way. We drove downtown and parked across the street from the theatre. Approaching the ticket window, I began to quietly sing a little victory song, "I won, I won — I won, I won, I won."

You know the rest of the story. Father overheard! Tears availing nothing, back to the car we went, and I never did see that movie.

In our relationship with our Heavenly Father we are to learn trust and submission, not manipulation and exploitation. Christ did not save us to search out scriptural principles and promises for molding God and creation to our own desires but rather to find life, joy and freedom in perfect submission to the Father's will. The Psalmist says, "I delight to do thy will, O God." (Psalm 40:8) Jesus testified in no uncertain terms of the joy of obedient submission to the Father when he said, "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me." (John 4:34)

In our generation, we are tempted by strange doctrines of "positive thinking," "positive confession," "possibility thinking" and so forth. Jesus, tempted in all ways as we ourselves and yet without sin, likewise faced the temptation of "possibility thinking" in Gethsemane when he prayed, "Father, all things are possible unto thee; take away this cup from me" (Mark 14:36) But, having so prayed, he rejected this possibility in favor of the Father's will saying, "Nevertheless not what I will, but what thou wilt."

Our lead article this month, by Ellen Myers, takes up this issue as she discusses a new book, *The Seduction of Christianity*, by Dave Hunt and T.A. McMahon. I highly recommend the book and Mrs. Myers' insightful and timely article.

Paul D. Ackerman

LETTERS AND COMMENTS

Dear Editor:

Concerning Ellen Myers' article on George MacDonald (Fall 1985) I think it should at least be admitted that St. George did believe or was influenced by the evolutionary cosmogony of his day.

"... and whoever can't tell is free to think — all waiting to flash, waiting for millions of ages — ever since the earth flew off from the sun, a great blot of fire, and began to cool." P.3 *Princess & Curdie* 1951 Ed. E.P. Dutton & Co. Inc.

The charge of universalism is probably warranted in light of his preface to *Letters from Hell* (1895).

MacDonald lived in a time of great tension on the origins question and not being a scientist etc. he largely ignored the problem. Being somewhat of a mystical nature (with much dead orthodoxy running about) he was not particularly troubled, and hence, his retention of biblical, creationistic ideas.

In Christ,
J. Dalton Witte
5208 Aspen
Bellaire, TX 77401

P.S. Despite the above comments I fully concur with C.S. Lewis' estimation of G.M. and my library is jammed full of unexpurgated G.M. volumes.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Paper on Weaknesses in Evolutionist Explanations of Origins

A sample letter to state legislators in support of teaching the scientific weaknesses in evolutionist explanations of origins in the public schools is available upon request (send SASE) from Citizens for Fairness in Education, Plano, Texas.

The same group has also published a 48-page paper, containing 116 categories of evolution's scientific weaknesses. The paper is authored by a scientist and suitable for classroom use in public high schools. Order at \$4.00 per copy ppd. from Citizens for Fairness in Education, 1516 Danube Lane, Plano, TX 75075.

Calligraphy

The calligraphy on page 4 was done by Douglas S. Gerhardt who receives his mail at 11302 Taft, Wichita, KS 67209.

Creationism Resource Information Packets Available

The Creation-Science Information Service is making available an information packet containing:

- 1) Catalogs for books, booklets, filmstrips, videos, films, etc., to four creation organizations.
- 2) Various booklets and brochures covering numerous aspects of the creation/evolution controversy.
- 3) A number of order blanks for submitting subscriptions to pro-creation periodicals.
- 4) Order blanks and advertisement flyers for books on the subject.

Packets are available for the price of \$1.00 from ORIS, 137 Oak Crest Dr., Lafayette, LA 70503.

Christian Wilderness Association

The Christian Wilderness Association is a membership association established in January 1985 by a group of evangelical Christians for the purpose of bringing the Christian view-point to the wilderness/environmental movement. The Christian Wilderness Association has four goals:

— The CWA hopes to bring an awareness of our responsibilities as stewards regarding environmental/wilderness issues before the Christian community.

God gave mankind dominion over the earth and all its creatures in Genesis 2. However, that dominion is not one of license but responsibility. We have the responsibility to be sure earth's resources are used wisely and to the glory of God.

— The CWA hopes to reassert the Biblical world-view within the wilderness/environmental movement. The present wilderness/environmental movement is grounded in a materialistic, evolutionary world-view that has led it to ignore God and His word, and seeks solutions based on utilitarian reasoning or pantheistic impulses.

— The CWA hopes to assist the local church in establishing its own wilderness outing program that will expose its young people to the glories and wonders of God as revealed in His creation. In our increasingly urban society such a program is needed.

— Finally, the CWA provides believers the opportunity to experience the wilderness in fellowship with others of like conviction.

The group's publication, *Christian Wilderness Report*, will further clarify the activities and goals of the Christian Wilderness Association.

Anyone wishing to contact the Christian Wilderness Association should write to:

Christian Wilderness Association
Box 878
Newhall, CA 91322

Meditation

God has created me to do Him some definite service; He has committed some work to me which He has not committed to another. I have my mission ~ I may never know it in this life, but I shall be told it in the next.

I am a link in a chain, a bond of connection between persons. He has not created me for nothing. I shall do good, I shall do His work.

Therefore I will trust Him.

Whatever, wherever I am. I cannot be thrown away. If I am in sickness, my sickness may serve Him; in perplexity, my perplexity may serve Him; if I am in sorrow, my sorrow may serve Him. He does nothing in vein. He knows what He is about. He may take away my friends, He may throw me among strangers. He may make me feel desolate, make my spirits sink, hide my future from me ~ still He knows what He is about.

Cardinal Newman

"My Yoke is Easy"

Mary Tenbrink

We are hurled in a whirlwind
of Satan's lies and schemes.
Snatching away at our loved ones
shaking our faith.
Broken spirits befall us
blinding us from His healing grace.
We walk in a path
Separated from God,
the blessed assurance
of meeting Him in heavenly places.

Quietly . . .
Jesus holds out His nail-scarred hands
offering a familiar promise.
Now I realize
He has been with me all along.
The Holy Spirit cleanses my heart
restores and strengthens me.
Compassion overflows
like a swelling and mighty river.
Tears turn to hope
Hope to love
Love to our Father's glory.
Glory to His everlasting promise.

Mary Tenbrink receives her mail at 2021 N. Old Manor, #303, Wichita, Kansas 67208.

Magic Self-Deification and the Everlasting Gospel

Ellen Myers

In their indispensable book *The Seduction of Christianity* (Eugene, OR 94702: Harvest House, third printing September 1985, \$7.95) Dave Hunt and T.A. McMahon present a wealth of stunning and incontrovertible evidences for the charge that (1) today's much-promoted teaching of "successful living," "positive thinking," "inner healing," "greater self-esteem," "faith in mind power," "exercising divine power" and the like is actually ancient sorcery in modern dress, and (2) it is permeating not only non-Christian circles through management seminars, education, psychiatry and pop psychology, but also Bible-believing Christians through churches, radio and television ministries, Christian colleges and counseling. But is this teaching truly biblical? The answer is, No. This teaching is similar to the anti-Christian "New Age" movement in that it promotes the manipulation of reality by magic techniques for the benefit and ultimately the deification of men's own selves. Hunt and McMahon believe it is the final satanic deception of mankind, resulting in the final great apostasy among professing Christians throughout the world before the Coming Again of our Lord (II Thessalonians 2:3). Already this teaching is perturbing our Christian brothers and sisters suffering for the faith "once delivered unto the saints" (Jude 3) in communist countries.

Robert Schuller's "gospel of success" is a prominent example of this false teaching. For him the "unchristian strategy of attempting to make people aware of their lost and sinful condition" is "destructive to human personality and, hence, counterproductive to the evangelism enterprise" (Hunt and McMahon, p. 15). This although Christ Himself said that He came to call sinners to repentance (Luke 5:32)! On an Amway motivational tape to its sales force Schuller said, "You don't know what power you have within you! . . . You make the world into anything you choose. Yes, you can make your world into whatever you want it to be" (p. 25). This concept is presented by Schuller and other prominent "Christian" preachers and teachers as quite compatible with the Bible. They encourage us to become wealthy, healthy and happy by such means as "commanding prayer" ordering God to do our will — in "faith" that He will and must obey us!

Why, then, did our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ refuse to "command" the Father to send His angels to deliver Him, but rather prayed at Gethsemane, "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me; nevertheless, not my will, but thine, be done" (Luke 22:42)? Why did He not consider equality with the Father a thing "to be grasped at" (Philippians 2:6)? True Christianity is to humble ourselves under the mighty hand of God (I Peter 5:6) that He may exalt us in due time (the time set by *Him*). Christ taught us to pray to our Father in Heaven, "*Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven*" (Matthew 6:10).

The chief technique taught at business management seminars, weight loss "behavior modification" classes, government training sessions and, alas, among huge numbers of Christians today is "imaging" or "visualizing" one's desired goal. "Image" yourself strong, wise, healed, slender, successful, rich, freed from childhood traumas and hangups — it works! "Image" another person doing what you want him to, such as making a contribution to your church or missionary outreach — it works! Hunt and McMahon cite a striking example of this technique by the congregation of "positive thinking" preacher Norman Vincent Peale (p. 148). Nevertheless, "imaging" or "visualizing" the state of altered reality you desire is, as Hunt and McMahon show, an ancient "shamanistic" or witchcraft technique. To seduce Christians into accepting and practicing it, bold promoters of the "gospel of success" will even call Christ Himself the greatest "shaman" (sorcerer, witchdoctor) or "positive thinker" of all times, the possessor of "psi power" (p. 131). Such teaching stands condemned under Mark 3:22-30, where Jesus warns us that "he that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." Christ is not a witchdoctor any more than He is an "avatar" in "New Age" or Eastern pantheist religious thought.

Belief in evolution is an integral part of this false gospel of magic self-deification. For example, an advertisement in the *Los Angeles Times* by the First United Methodist Church of Hollywood promoted the appearance of "SHRI MATAJI NIRMALA DEVI . . . She will awaken in you the force that will change your life and change the world. This awakening . . . grants inner peace, health and joy. It is the last evolutionary step, promised by traditions that stretch back to the beginnings of human spiritual awareness . . ." (p. 75).

A founding father of this false gospel of self-deification is the late evolutionist priest Pierre Teilhard de Chardin. His disciple Robert Muller, Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations where he has worked for thirty-six years, "builds his speeches around Teilhard's philosophy of global evolution . . . and of the birth of a collective brain to the human species'" (p. 77). Muller considers himself and is accepted by Catholic educational circles as a bona-fide Catholic Christian; he was the keynote speaker at the 82nd annual convention, religious education congress and exposition of the National Catholic Education Association in St. Louis on April 8-11, 1985. This congress also featured other leading "New Age" personalities such as Carl Sagan and Robert Theobald. Some effect of their thinking upon Catholic parochial school education is inevitable.

Teilhard's disciple Jean Houston is director of the Foundation for Mind Research of Pomona, New York. Besides conducting seminars at Catholic institutions such as Kansas Newman College, Wichita, in February 1984, and being a workshop leader at the 1984 National Catholic Education Association convention, she also instructs businessmen and high government official in Washington in "self-realization" techniques. She has groups act out purported memories of their evolutionary advance from fish to amphibian, reptile and early, furry human, and might then tell them "to extend yourselves even further — into . . . the next stage of your own evolution" (Hunt/McMahon, pp. 75-76). Houston conducts workshops and seminars around the world. The wealthy Institute for Conscious Evolution in San Francisco offers "evolutionary counseling services" and provides "courses in Conscious Evolution toward M.A. or Ph.D. degrees" (p. 93).

Besides evolution, the perennial "gospel" of magic self-deification rests upon the pantheist premise that all is one, including God. Of course the "God" of pantheism is not the God of biblical Christianity. Magic self-deification *must* reject God as the Creator and absolute, sovereign Lord of the Bible, because He could not be "altered" or "commanded" by man's magic methods, nor could fundamental reality as His creation out of nothing by His creative decree in the beginning. To their great merit, Hunt and McMahon stress this point repeatedly. You *must* have a pantheist-evolutionist world if you would magically manipulate the guiding "forces" or "spirits" of this world to be your own god.

How, then, is it possible that people sincerely believing themselves to be Christians cannot see that this teaching is the opposite of Christ's and the Bible's? Were basic, indispensable parts of the true biblical gospel of salvation neglected in their conversion and nurturing? Have they forgotten — have they never learned in their hearts, minds and souls — that salvation in Christ does not include a guarantee of earthly well-being and power, but demands the mortifying — the crucifixion — of our old self? that Christ's promise is salvation from *sin* and granting of *repentance* unto eternal life? that true Christianity presupposes biblical creation and man's fall from original perfection in God's image and likeness? that man's goal is to be restored in his original likeness to his Creator by the Holy Spirit? that without repentance and remission of sins thanks to Christ's blood shed at Calvary we are "dead in trespasses and sins" (Ephesians 2:1, 5)?

How is it that people professing faith in Christ can be persuaded to turn to faith in themselves by trusting in their own "mind power," "positive thinking," "expanded consciousness" or "the divine principle within them"? How can they not see that our purpose in this life is not to "esteem" or strengthen our own selves, far less to set up our own selves as gods whose will must be done — but rather to die to self so we might be made new creations in Christ (II Corinthians 5:15, 17)?

How can Christians not see, professing to know the only true God and Jesus Christ Whom He has sent (John 17:13), that this God neither will nor can serve us as a cosmic slot machine, altering reality to our wish and command when we pull the correct magic lever? Yes, our prayer has power, and we "have the petitions that we desired of Him" — if we ask any thing *according to his will* (I John 5:14-15). I could deeply desire that my prayer could raise up a beloved husband, a beloved child and a beloved grandson from the dead, and grant normal mental faculties to my dear daughter with Down's Syndrome (as a fellow Christian believing in "commanding prayer" once demanded of me) — but His blessed will was and is that my beloved dead be present with Him (Philippians 1:23, II Corinthians 5:1, 8), and that my "retarded" child remain childlike and loving in Christ, and relatively immune to temptation all her life. Our God is not merely the earthly satisfier of our earthly desires but the heavenly, eternal Sanctifier of our immortal souls. He is the aweful, wonderful, altogether loving because altogether merciful and righteous God who alone is worthy to be worshipped and praised. His Spirit "makes intercession for the saints according to the will of God" and "we know that all things (including grief, pain, poverty, persecution and death) work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to his purpose" (Romans 8:27-28). We can have power and authority only *in* Him, not *over* Him; this is

why Jesus told His seventy disciples not to rejoice that the spirits they had cast out in His name were subject to them, but rather "because your names are written in heaven" (Luke 10:20).

Our God, our Creator, our holy and righteous God against whom we all have sinned and of whose glory we all have fallen short (Romans 3:23) is *unchangeable* (James 1:17). He is not the putty god of evolutionist pantheism submitting to magic manipulation so our own will might be done. If He were — consider it well — we could never trust Him.

Look at our situation if biblical creation were not true, and if God were part and parcel of an ever-changing evolutionist world. Man exercising self-deifying dominion by science or magic (modern science actually arose as a branch of magic, and is now largely returning to it — see Hunt/McMahon, Chapters 3 and 8) would be unhindered by absolute standards of good and evil in God's character/law. In any evolutionist universe what is considered "good" today may well be "evil" tomorrow. Realizing that in such a universe I, a "half-Jew" raised in Nazi Germany, could never call Nazism absolutely and always evil first compelled me to seek the God of the Bible. Since man's dominion of the world makes "good" and "evil" meaningless or contentless terms by confounding their absolute difference, it makes man's dominion ultimately meaningless — absurd — as well. Only dominion *under God* is ultimately meaningful (Genesis 1:26, 28).

Most ominously, in a pantheist-evolutionist world of magic self-deification "might is right," as the Nazis consistently proclaimed from within that world view. Any benefit to one's self can only be temporary and uncertain as others, too, seek to exercise magic dominion over the world for *their* profit. Moreover, "faulty" magic would backfire against its practitioner, just as do plain material objects falsely used. This means that even in simple "result-oriented" terms, the gospel of magic self-deification is a fraud which can never keep its illusory promises.

The confrontation of our day is clearly between the delusion of self-deification by modern magic techniques in an evolutionist-pantheist world, and the full biblical gospel of salvation in Christ founded on biblical creation. It is our Lord's eternal providence and blessed will for our time that the everlasting gospel of biblical creation, too (and not only the enemy's seduction) is proclaimed today around the world as never before. It is the "everlasting gospel" preached by the angel of Revelation 14:6-7. "Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment is come: and worship him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters." More than ever before it is evident that the gospel of biblical creation *must* be presented in truly biblical evangelism, and in truly biblical nurturing of Christian believers. This everlasting gospel is our invincible and indispensable armor and weapon against the satanic counterfeit "gospel" of man's dominion over the world through magic self deification.

Note. Related articles by this writer in past issues of the CSSH Quarterly are:

"Pantheistic Mysticism vs. Created Reality" (IV:3, Spring 1982)

"The Ultimate Evolutionist Model: Evolution by Purposive 'Forces'"
(IV:4, Summer 1982)

"Denying True Reality — Mystic Evolutionism in Practice" (V:1, Fall 1982)

"Self-Image — or Created Identity in Christ" (VI:2, Winter 1983)

"Damned Nonsense" (VI:3, Spring 1984)

Photocopies are available at \$2.00 ppd. per article. Request from Reprint Editor, CSSH Quarterly, 1429 N. Holyoke, Wichita, Kansas 67208, USA.

APPENDIX

A List of "New Age"/"Positive Thinking"/"Self-Esteem"/"Gospel of Prosperity" — Infected Personalities and Ministries

Source: Dave Hunt & T.A. McMahon, *The Seduction of Christianity* (Eugene, OR: Harvest House, Third Printing, September 1985)

Name	Book(s)	Ministry/Organization, Concept
Bennett, Rita	<i>You Can Be Emotionally Free</i>	wife of Episcopal priest
Bristol, Claude	<i>The Magic of Believing</i>	
Capps, Charles	<i>The Tongue—A Creative Force</i>	"Positive Confession Movement"
Cho, Paul Yonggi	<i>The Fourth Dimension Solving Life's Problems</i>	pastor of huge church in South Korea
Clark, Glenn	<i>The Soul's Desire</i>	founder, "Camps Farthest Out"
Copeland, Kenneth		"Positive Confession Movement"
Copeland, Gloria		television ministry
Douglass, Stephen B.	<i>Making the Most of Your Mind</i> (with Lee Roddy)	
Ferguson, Marilyn	<i>The Aquarian Conspiracy</i>	publisher, "Brain/Mind Bulletin"
Foster, Richard	<i>Celebration of Discipline</i>	professor, Friends University, Wichita, KS
Goines, Frank		publisher, "Prophecy and Economics Newsletter"
Grubb, Norman		missionary, "Union Life"
Hagin, Kenneth		"Positive Confession Movement"
Hill, Napoleon	<i>Think and Grow Rich</i>	"Positive Mental Attitude" (PMA)
Holmes, Ernest	<i>The Science of Mind</i>	Church of Religious Science
Houston, Joan	<i>Mind Games. The Guide to Inner Space</i> (with Robert Masters)	Foundation for Mind Research
Kelsey, Morton T.	<i>The Christian and the Supernatural; Christo-Psychology</i>	Episcopal priest
Larson, Bruce	<i>The Whole Christian;</i> & others	Presbyterian leader
Linn, Dennis	<i>Praying With Another For Healing</i> (with Sheila Fabricant)	Jesuit priests
Linn, Matthew		
Lovett, C.S.	<i>Longing To Be Loved</i>	"Personal Christianity Newsletter"
Mandino, Og	<i>The Greatest Secret in the World</i>	

Masters, Robert	<i>Mind Games: The Guide to Inner Space</i> (with Jean Houston)	
Meyer, Paul		Success Motivation Institute
Miller, Calvin		author; publishes with Word Publishing, Waco, TX
Mitchell, Edgar		Institute of Noetic Sciences; former astronaut
Muller, Robert		Asst Sec -General, U.N.
MacNutt, Francis		Catholic author
Nightingale, Earl		Success Motivation Institute
Osborne, Cecil		"Primal Integration Therapy" ("Christian" version of "Primal Scream Therapy" of Arthur Janov)
	<i>Healing</i>	
Paulk, Earl	<i>Satan Unmasked</i>	
Peale, Norman Vincent	<i>The Power of Positive Thinking</i>	minister, author
Peck, M. Scott	<i>People of the Lie, The Road Less Traveled</i>	psychiatrist
Price, Frederick K.C.		pastor, TV minister, Los Angeles
Prophet, Elizabeth Clare		"Church Universal and Triumphant;" "I AM" group
Roddy, Lee	<i>Making the Most of Your Mind</i> (with Stephen B. Douglass)	
Romney, Rodney R.	<i>Journey to Inner Space</i>	pastor, First Baptist Church, Seattle, WA
Samuels, Mike, M.D.	<i>Finding God-in-Us</i> <i>The Well Body Book;</i> Spirit Guides: Access to Inner Worlds	physician
Sandford, John	<i>The Transformation of the Inner Man</i>	"inner healing"
Sandford, Paula	<i>The Healing Light,</i>	author, seminar leader
Sanford, Agnes	<i>The Healing Gifts of the Spirit, many others</i>	
Schuller, Robert	<i>Self-Esteem, Living Positively One Day At A Time; & others</i>	minister, TV ministry
Spangler, David	<i>Reflections on the Christ</i>	Findhorn Foundation
Stapleton, Ruth Carter	<i>The Experience of Inner Healing</i>	"inner healing"
Stone, W. Clement	<i>Success Through A Positive Mental Attitude</i>	businessman
Stoop, David	<i>Self-Talk Key to Personal Growth</i>	pastor; clinical psychologist
Sutphen, Dick	<i>Self-Help Update</i>	Valley of the Sun Books and Tapes, Scottsdale, AZ
Teillhard de Chardin, Pierre	<i>The Divine Milieu,</i> <i>The Phenomenon of Man,</i> & others	Jesuit priest (d. 1955)
Tilton, Robert		pastor, Word of Faith Outreach, Dallas, Texas
Treat, Casey		pastor, Christian Faith Center, Seattle, WA, tape ministry
Vaswig, William L.	<i>I Prayed, He Answered</i>	Lutheran pastor

Volkman, Bill	<i>"As Gods" Without Denying Our Humanity</i>	
Wilkerson, Ralph	<i>ESP or HSP? — Exploring Your Latent Seventh Sense</i>	Melodyland Publishers (in southern California)
Wimber, John	<i>Signs and Wonders and Church Growth</i>	
Wise, Robert L.	<i>Healing of the Past</i>	instructor, Fuller Seminary School of World Missions pastor, author; in Presbyterian Renewal Movement
Ziglar, Zig	<i>See You At The Top</i>	"Christian Success Movement"

Computer Initialized

Alice Bostrom

Search my life screen,
 O God,
 and know my processes.
 Try me,
 and know my memory banks.
 See if there be
 any faulty logic in me.
 Create a program
 which I can follow
 in the way everlasting
 based on Psalm 139:23-24

Alice Bostrom receives her mail at 3825 Kentucky Ave N., Minneapolis, MN 55427.

God "The Creator" Man "The Artist" Created in His Image

Margaret Stucki

Gen 1:26. And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; . . .

Gen. 1:27. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God, created he him; . . .

Can man refuse his responsibility for his creations any more than God can deny that He made man in His image when He created the world? "For the directest manifestation of Deity to man is in His own image, that is, in man. . . . It cannot be supposed that the bodily shape of man resembles, or resembled, any bodily shape in Deity; the likeness must therefore be, or have been, in the spirit."¹

Granting that the likeness of man to the image of God must be of the spirit as John Ruskin says or as Dorothy Sayers² suggests in the "creativeness" of that soul, does that really solve the problem or explain why God did make man appear as he does in this particular body? Does it explain why Christ appeared in the shape of man's body? Why this shape, the human anatomy, and no other? There is a fact here which must be acknowledged even if the reason for it remains a mystery to the human intellect. This author accepts the creation of man's body in God's image as an act of God³ and will proceed to investigate why in the twentieth century a malevolent horde of artists have set out to destroy that image.

The human body is a wonderful creation⁴ perfected by the imagination of God and pulsing with blood warmed by His almighty love. Consider how it combines function with beauty. Hair, for example, is not only a protective covering for the head, but also a delight to the eye and a pleasure to the touch. And skin? How unique in its various colors, never needing to be darned, never wearing thin through years of hard usage. How beautiful in the sunlight is the pink-gold of the white man's flesh, or the iridescent hues of the black man; each race with its special coloring and beauty. But higher and greater by far than the outward physical beauties are the spiritual beauties which, however, are outwardly visible in the fine art of painting. Spirit is the most expressive force in life. How can that force not leave its imprint throughout matter? It is not the invisible spirit that the artist is interested in or the inaudible spirit that the musician is concerned with. The visible world is itself the material expression of God's creative power. How could then a person or a landscape plainly depicted be without a spiritual significance? All matter obeys the will of God

Excerpted with permission from Margaret Stucki's doctoral dissertation, *War on Light The Destruction of the Image of God in Man Through Modern Art*, Freedom University Press, 1975.

CSSH Quarterly
Vol. VIII, No. 3 (Spring 1986)

and any material thing is expressive of that truth. To deny truth in your delineation of nature is to distort God's meaning.⁵ The spirit is not hidden under the flesh so that we have to dispense with man's body to speak about man; nay, the spirit lives in the body, inhabits the temple. By studying the face and body of man one can see what a spirit he has. All the talk about painting the invisible by destroying the visible forms of reality is false logic.

The human body as the image of God is the most important object of the fine artist's representations. When men dishonor their own bodies or others, they sin against God who warned that our bodies are not our own, but belong to the Holy Ghost. Every perversion directed against the body or its image as projected by the artist is a sin against the Holy Ghost. We should accept our bodies as God gave them to us and do nothing to defile them either by ingestion or projection. The sin of the modern artist is that he hates himself and shows this by the distorted images of the human body that he paints or sculpts. Since man is created in the image of God, this destruction of man's body is an attack on the image of God and a direct disobedience of the first commandment, Mark 12:30, And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength.

The doctor⁶ sees the body as a functioning machine which he can manipulate to some extent when it malfunctions. The Christian artist sees the body as a creation of God and he affirms its meaningfulness by showing in his delineations how full of grace or strength or beauty the body can be. The carnal-minded only see the body for what it can be used for in terms of dollars or sensual pleasure. They do not respect it as the temple of the Holy Ghost. No materialist philosophy will suffice to explain the body or enable one to truly perceive it. That image or projection created by the artist is a direct result of his appraisal through his soul and spirit. Vision is a power of the soul and spirit so that no eye sees the same. Greater vision is given to the virtuous:

Psa. 119:18. Open thou mine eyes, that I may behold the wondrous things out of thy law.

Ezek. 12:2. Son of man, thou dwellest in the midst of a rebellious house, which have eyes to see, and see not; . . .

Matt. 13:13. Therefore speak I to them in parables: because they seeing see not; . . .

Until your heart be converted your eyes will not be blessed. Art which comes not from blessed eyes is a curse and a scourge to the land.

Acts 19:2c. . . We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.

Acts 26:18. To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God.

The destruction of the image of God in man in today's art is the greatest visual sign of the corrupt interior of many modern men's souls. Schilder⁷ demonstrates how the human psyche continually constructs and destructs its own image of its own body and the bodies of others; it is a dynamic creation continuously in flux. There is a constant interaction or socialization of these images according to the emotional and mental maturity of the image-maker.

Art is not going to be cured of its emptiness and ugliness by courses in design. Only Christ can teach design. Only a belief in Him can illumine men's hearts to which their eyes will lose their darkness and perceive a higher truth and greater spirituality.

Rom. 1:19-20. . . . That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so they are without excuse.

Ortega y Gasset says that "wherever we look we see a flight from the human person. The methods of dehumanization are many."⁸ Why this flight from the human person? Is it not guilt that hides man's face and body from God even as Adam and Eve tried to hide after their original sin? Modern man has dishonored God and consequently he lets the image of God in his own body, the temple of the Holy Spirit, fall into ruin. The attack on the body is an attack on God. The fury is directed against God first and then against self. The brutality on canvas is only equalled by the callousness in reality where millions of people have been tortured to death by the atheist dictators of our century.

Thinkers in varied professions, including psychiatrists, have noticed the resemblance of modern art to the work of the insane; this has led them to characterize our culture as schizoid, or split, or shattered, in many titles of illustrious books. Yet many of these specialists will not acknowledge that the cause of the illness in our culture is the same for the artist as well as for the schizophrenic. Although the products of the hands of artists and schizophrenics resemble each other as we inspect them, these learned men strenuously disavow their radical identity. They say that we must not equate the works of the insane with the works of the modern artist, even if they are so alike that no one can tell them apart. These professors get all twisted up in their logic until both the insane create unconsciously and the artists create unconsciously, but the latter are conscious of their unconscious and that, they claim, makes all the difference. Does it? Shall we not know them by their fruits? And by crediting the creation of art to the unconscious, they think to relieve the artist of his responsibility and at the same time of his virtues as a genius. It is not all pure inspiration; much is a moral struggle and spiritual triumph.

God is not dead and His Son, Christ, lives and reigns through all eternity. One can read the riddle of the universe through many ciphers like those of a philosopher, a mathematician, or a musician, but since the creation of the world, the will of God has always ruled the world whether man will or will not acknowledge it. God is Light. In Him there is no darkness at all.

Hans Sedlmayr points out that in the phases of the picture's disintegration we have the dissolution of the boundaries of art in the provinces of painting and sculpture between the productions of genuine art, primitives, children, and lunatics. What a strange company of bedfellows! Objections were made to Irene Jakab's idea of there being no essential differences between the work of the insane and the fine artists, in a paper⁹ presented to the *Third International Congress of Social Science* in Zagreb, Yugoslavia in 1968, but the *American Journal of Art Therapy* editors would not print, "*A Professional Painter Speaks to Professional Psychiatrists*," on the ground that the painter was unkind to Jakab's opinion.

The late Harvard anthropologist, Earnest Hooten, considered most modern painters in "a state of confusion" and the rest either fakes or imitators. Art critic, Alfred Brooks, says that the artist is not confused but "he is merely reflecting the times." Dallas Pratt of the National Mental Health Foundation

says it is a meaningless waste of time to compare true art with paintings of the schizophrenic. This, he considers harmful to both fields — modern art and mental therapy. In the light of his statement it is interesting that art therapists generally agree that a sign of a patient's improved mental condition is revealed in steps toward realism in his art. Hooten devised a quiz based on an exhibition of insane art and modern art which was featured in *Parade* magazine. Trained artists cannot achieve a good score for differentiating between them. If there is no recognizable difference, is there a difference? From this common expressiveness in picturing, may we not postulate a common origin or cause for the art work whether or not the person was sane or insane?

This common origin lies in the mental realm of the irrational, whether chosen consciously or unconsciously, and this realm is ruled by the Devil, who contrary to some contemporary notions, does exist.¹⁰ The art of the primitive, the child, and the insane are thus related by their common undeveloped consciousness and in their fallen state from the time when Adam and Eve chose to disobey God. They are all separated from a true knowledge of God (though in different categories) and only as they grow to maturity in the light of the revealed Word of God does their picturing take on rational proportions and divine meanings.

According to some psychiatrists there is a collective unconscious which is a substratum of *primordial images* in all people in contrast to the *personal unconscious* described by Freud. To project such images is called by psychoanalysts "a regression very far-reaching." Interestingly, and by deduction uncritically, J.H. Plokker exempts the "modern" artist such as Picasso (whose works exemplify such characteristics) from such regression. He does so, ostensibly, on the grounds that they are *otherwise* normal. Are they? And what has that got to do with their abnormal artistic projections? He states:

We are confronted by the impossibility of identifying schizophrenic utterances with mentally healthy 'modern art.' The sufferer from schizophrenia is in fact a solitary person outside the human community. He feels no responsibility towards his fellow-beings and does not concern himself with what people think of his productions! (Often they are "coarsely aggressive or sexually obscene.")¹¹

This occurs in Picasso's painting continually and from the same original source that the schizophrenic gets his images or inspiration, the Devil! The abode of the Devil is Hell.¹² Ruskin said:

I do not merely *believe* there is such a place as hell. I *know* there is such a place; and I know that when men have got to the point of believing virtue impossible but through dread of it, they have got *into* it.¹³

. . . "The Devil, or betraying Spirit, is *in him*" is the most scientifically accurate which you can apply to any person so influenced.¹⁴

Ruskin further says in *The Eagle's Nest*, that the arts of the present Europe are "revolutionary" and a result of evil passion which distorts and is the result of disobedience.

Jay E. Adams says that "Men are on the run from God."¹⁵ Freudian thinking which itself is false and distorted has undermined our law and psychiatry. The Freudian flight from personal responsibility by men on the run from God, according to Richard T. LaPiere,¹⁶ is dulling, if not extracting the teeth of the law. Freud is the idol of the modern artists and the Devil is their God! Herein

lies the similarity of the primitive and "modern" schizoid images — in the radical identity of their source. Jay Adams came to the conclusion that the inmates he was involved with at mental institutions in his studies were sinful, not sick.¹⁷ So are modern artists.

The reason for man's alienation from God in this century is his loss of belief in God, which plunges him into deep despair. This rebellion from God results in his creative powers, such as those of sex and art which should be used to the glory of God in joyous creating, being the first to be turned against God in a self-destroying war on light. Man has light only as God reveals it to him; when man believes himself a demi-god he is in revolt against God and in league with Satan, the prince of darkness.

Eph. 5:8. Walk as children of light.

Eph. 5:11. And have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.

Some art critics and psychiatrists have excused the Satanic images of certain modern artists on the grounds that they are "prophetic" and only show what our times are like, but not what the artists themselves are like.

Those who have fellowship by taste or preference for these "deeds of darkness," the images of modern art, are themselves guilty of being evil. To call that good which is evil is a sin. To call "modern" art *good* or *fine* art is a falsehood. Only that historian who describes it as the handiwork of the hellish-minded deserves our commendation and all the fashionable book writers and reviewers, art buyers and brokers, who do not recognize the products of an evil soul for what they are — brushstrokes of the Devil, are disqualified as teachers of the "children of light." They walk in darkness and stumble, and sit by the roadside of life in this twentieth century — blind beggars sitting in the shadow of death. Our children are the inheritors of Light. Let them be guided by the works of artists that have seen the light and believe in Jesus Christ. It is the duty of all Christians to seek the Light actively and encourage good Christian artists. How ghastly are the images of those who destroy God's creations. Let Christians seek light and carry lamps of love into the darkness.

FOOTNOTES

- 1 John Ruskin, *The Works of John Ruskin*, ed. E.T. Cook and A. Wedderburn, George Allen, London, 1903, *Modern Painters*, vol. VII, Part IX, p. 259.
- 2 Dorothy L. Sayers, *The Mind of the Maker*, the World Publishing Co., Cleveland, 1956, Ch. 2. Her analysis is excellent; she suggests one pay attention also to the use of the word *our*.
- 3 This act of God resulted in a perfect human body by direct creation as to Adam and indirect creation as to Eve. The components of this perfect creation of man and woman — body, soul, spirit, mentality, etc. — reflected back to God His image as capable through the perfect being he created. Man, however, committed sin against God and degenerated so that God's image is not reflected back to Him by those who reject salvation by grace through faith in the blood sacrifice of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. But those who believe unto salvation are promised a glorified body like that of

the resurrected Christ so that an image of God even better than the original Adam is ascertained. In the interim the saved people reflect His image through regeneration even though this is housed in an imperfect body, soul, spirit, mentality, etc.

⁴ Gen. 2:7 — "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul."

⁵ This of course in the Biblical sense as reflected in the Psalms and elsewhere, not in the pantheistic meaning.

⁶ Christian Barnard, M.D., "The heart is nothing but a pump." *Zu Freien Ufern*, 2/1974, Drei Eichen Verlag AG, Munich, p. 107.

⁷ Paul Schilder, *The Image and Appearance of the Human Body*, International Universities Press, Inc., N.Y., 1950.

⁸ José Ortega y Gasset, *The Dehumanization of Art and Other Writings On Art and Culture*, Doubleday & Co., Inc., N.Y., 1948, p. 30.

⁹ Margaret Stucki, *A Professional Painter Speaks to Professional Psychiatrists*.

¹⁰ Lewis Sperry Chafer, *Satan, His Motives and Methods*, Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich., 1970, p. 72, ". . . this class of humanity believes least in his reality, it ignorantly rejects its real leader as being a mythical person."

¹¹ J.H. Plokker, *Artistic Self-expression in Mental Disease. The Shattered Image of Schizophrenics*, Mouton & Co., The Hague, trans. I. Findlay, 1964, p. 76.

¹² Hell is used as all inclusive; no attempt is here intended for the exegesis of the various original words in *The Holy Bible* and their dispensational interpretations.

¹³ John Ruskin, *Ibid. Time and Tide*, §51 (Vol. XVII pp. 360-1).

¹⁴ *Ibid. Eagle's Nest*, §69.

¹⁵ Jay E. Adams, *Competent to Counsel*, Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Co., Nutley, N.J., 1971, p. 71.

¹⁶ Richard T. LaPiere, *Psychiatry and Responsibility*, Van Nostrand Press, Princeton, 1962, p. 80.

¹⁷ Mark 5:2, *The Holy Bible*.

Creative "Forms" in the Biblical Creation Perspective

Ellen Myers

God used the first two days of creation to bestow form upon the earth He had initially created out of nothing (Genesis 1:1) without form and void, and shrouded in darkness (Genesis 1:2). The Holy Spirit moved upon the waters covering the earth's surface, and God's word ordered light to be there. Then God divided the light from the darkness, named the light Day and the darkness Night; this was the first day (evening and morning, twenty-four hours) of creation. Next God made a firmament between the waters above it and the waters on earth and called the firmament between the waters above it and the waters on earth and called the firmament Heaven. This was the second day of creation (Genesis 1:2b-8).

God formed the beasts of the field and the fowls of the air from the dust of the ground (Genesis 2:19), and finally also Adam (Genesis 2:7), whom, alone among all His creatures, He made "a living soul" by breathing into his nostrils the breath of life (Genesis 2:7). To give Adam a help meet for him, He formed Eve from Adam's rib (Genesis 2:21-23), thus laying down woman's being "flesh of man's flesh" and "bone of his bones" and hence their becoming "one flesh" in marriage (Genesis 2:23-24).

In accord with God's creation mandate to man to exercise dominion over all the earth and its creatures (Genesis 1:26, 28), implemented through Adam's charge to dress and keep the Garden of Eden (Genesis 2:15), God brought the animals He had formed before Adam so Adam would name them (Genesis 2:19). Adam responded to God by naming the animals according to their God-created identity or essential character, manifested of necessity by their forms in their various kinds. Of course the creatures' forms perfectly corresponded to their inward characters in God's perfect creation as yet unmarred by man's Fall, much as in worthy human works of creativity (even today, after the Fall) their essential content and outward form intentionally and fittingly complement each other.

As with the formation of earth on Days One and Two of creation week, so it is with creation and formation of all other creatures of God. All are known to Him from before His initial creation of the world out of nothing, for "known unto God are all his works from the beginning of the world" (Acts 15:18); we also know that faithful believers in Christ were chosen in Him "before the foundation of the world" (Ephesians 1:4, 1 Peter 1:2). However, God forms His creatures in visible matter in the fullness of created time. This is not forced upon Him, as He is indeed able to both create and form His creatures in no time at all; Christ's first miracle, the changing of the water into wine at the wedding at Cana (John 2:1-11), shows Him as God the Instant Creator if He so wills (as do other miracles of our Lord, for instance, the feeding of the five thousand from five loaves and two fishes recorded in Matthew 14:14-21).

In His omniscience and unfathomable power, therefore, God might have caused all His original creation to "come forth" fully formed, instantly, even as He spoke light into instant existence. His forming the earth, the animals, and man in this is, as all His infallible, inerrant Word in the Scriptures, given for our edification. The sketch of His mode of forming His creation in Genesis 1 and 2 is particularly relevant and nurturing for our own creative efforts. Rather than exercising His sovereign prerogative as Creator regardless of time, He chose to give outward form to His eternal creative decree in six days. His mode of forming visibly, in time, that which he foreknew beyond time in Himself foretells the mode in which we men and women created in His image and likeness are creative ourselves by forming visibly in time that creative vision first arising in us as it were invisibly and out of time.

God thus accommodated His own creation work to our human mode of creativity, foreseen and made by Him. He thereby revealed Himself as our altogether loving, gracious Lord and Father, Love Himself in His everlasting Counsel of the Three Persons of the Trinity, from before the foundation of the world and in it. He humbled Himself to appear as it were of our flesh and blood (Hebrews 2:14) already in the first two days of creation, so he might be like His children in the act of creation. We can be bold to say so because Jesus Christ, the Father's image, the firstborn of every creature (Colossians 1:15) and by Whom all things hold together (Col. 1:17), also humbled Himself, taking part of our flesh and blood literally (Hebrews 2:14). Jesus Christ, "being in the form of God . . . took upon himself the form of a servant, and . . . the likeness of men" (Philippians 2:6-7). And Jesus Christ "does whatsoever the Father does" (John 5:19), and "always does these things that please the Father" (John 8:29b). We can now see that the Father and indeed also the Son and the Holy Spirit have humbled themselves to condescend to our creaturely level in the very act of initial creation. Let theological modernists scoff at the Genesis account of creation because it is "anthropomorphic," portraying God as resembling man. We who by His grace know Him as our Father through Jesus Christ rejoice and glory in His loving condescension in both the acts and the account of Genesis 1 and 2. Yes, He deliberately made Himself "anthropomorphic" in forming His creation in six days of time (yet preserving His divine Majesty and glory by doing it all in *only* six days of time!), so we might recognize and rejoice and thank Him for our likeness to, our kinship with Him! Gloriously from the very beginning of the creation "the foolishness of God is wiser than men" (I Corinthians 1:25a).

Now as man is a creature (albeit made in our Creator's own image and likeness), he is himself a "form" or "vessel" shaped by God. Even as the earth before the first two days of creation week, so our bodies are foreknown in all minutest details by God before He begins to form us in our mothers' wombs (Psalm 139:14-16; Isaiah 44:2, 24; Jeremiah 1:5). We are indeed "fearfully and wonderfully made" in that God ordained strength even from the mouths of our babes and sucklings, visits us, made us "a little lower than the angels" and, most astounding of all, gave us dominion over the works of His own hands (Psalm 8). We are the living vessels of God which have power to shape, as His stewards, all His other lesser vessels. We can increase their beauty and joy when working in harmony with the will of our Creator, or else mar and grieve them. Because we sin, willfully disobeying His will, "all creation groans and

travails in pain together until now" and earnestly waits and hopes for the full redemption of God's children from among fallen mankind (Romans 8:19-23).

Note that God altered the original perfect forms of creation in response to man's sin. He made the serpent to crawl on his belly and eat dust; the woman's childbearing to be painful; the ground to be cursed by bringing forth thorns and thistles; man's body to decay and return to the dust from which it had been taken (Genesis 3:14-19). All these punitive changes reflected the rebellion and pain man (and Satan) had inflicted upon God, and altered man's life to reflect the likeness of the Creator robbed of His undiluted joy in His original creation (Genesis 1:31) — with the sacrifice of His only begotten, beloved, sinless Son needed for atonement and redemption.

As with our Lord both before and after the Fall, so in human creative work vision (content) and form must fit together. Ideally, as with God, they do so "from the beginning" (Acts 15:18), that is, the original creative vision already includes a view of the form in which it will be clothed and thereby revealed. However, man's creative vision usually does not come to him all at once but by stages and increments entailing adjustments of form. This is all right if the overall unity of vision and hence form are preserved, but fatal if lack of cohesion in theme and form results. Of course, some disparity between vision and form is present even in the best works created by man. This inevitable disparity is the result of the Fall where man himself, stepping outside His Maker's law for man, became in content and form disparate from his Creator's original creation vision and form.

While fallen man may produce flawed forms in his creative work in a sense innocently, due to his fallenness, it would seem that when a human creative work is flawed because of a false vision the fault is without excuse (Romans 1:18-21). For all creative vision comes from God and is true to true reality, seeing good as good and evil as evil, beauty as beauty and ugliness or perversion as ugliness and perversion. Man may be an inept implementer of forms (though the more faithfully he labors under God, the more diligently he will show himself, in the choice and technical training for artistic forms, "a workman that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing" fit forms from unfit — II Timothy 2:15). But if he bends a creative vision to please the "powers that be," his work, however technically adequate, is wicked and false. Examples of "bent" vision are propagandistic works slanting truth to promote a party line; this is why Soviet art is so sterile and why its forms are so rigid and mechanical. (When communism in Russia still fed on some truth as during its consolidation and relative cultural freedom in the 1920s, it could still produce great art, such as the movie "The Battleship Potemkin.") Other examples of "bent" vision are, of course, art works seeking to dispense with vision altogether, as though forms alone could exist and communicate meaning.

The disparity between vision and form is always greatest in times of cultural upheaval. We find, for instance, that the rigid "balanced" literacy and artistic forms of sixteenth and seventeenth century European Classicism, like the old wineskins in Christ's parable (Matthew 9:17), could not contain the new wine of burgeoning Romantic creativity. As with our Lord before and after the Fall, forms must needs be changed when visions and content change. Our own age is, of course, one of social and cultural upheaval unprecedented in scope because for the first time in human history revolutionary changes involve all

the world simultaneously. Hence, in large part, our modern artistic preoccupation with form.

We may date the beginning of our age by the publication of Charles Darwin's *Origin of Species* in 1859 because this book showed how man could dispense altogether with God the *Creator*. Anchoring the beginning of the world not in God's creation out of nothing and in God's creative decree in eternity but in lawless, everchanging flow of time and chance rendered *all* acts of creation meaningless. Denying God the Creator and replacing Him with evolution entails denying man as creator. What man stupidly calls human creativity, the evolutionist must assert, is really nothing but the product of matter in motion.

The absolute distinction between good and evil also falls victim to the evolutionist world view. This means that literary plots (visions) involving the struggle between good and evil become meaningless and are discarded. Some artists of the turn of our century received visions of the reality of evil; for example, the Russian painter Michael Vrubel (1856-1910) left us realistic and frightening portrayals of Satan until he suffered a mental breakdown in 1902 (as did Nietzsche, the prophet of the evolutionist "transvaluation of all values," in 1889, the year Adolf Hitler was born). Artistic surrealism also portrayed this sense of an evil reality lurking behind falsely "normal" reality, foreshadowing World Wars I and II and the hell of the modern Nazi and Communist death camps.

Having shut their inward eyes to God the Creator and His gift of creative vision, modern artists increasingly concentrated on form by itself or attempted to do away with form as an impediment to artistic freedom. (Eliminating form altogether is impossible because, as a painter friend pointed out to me, every picture is limited to the size and shape of the canvas on which it is painted, hence locked in form. Form is an unchangeable fact of reality pointing to the eternal Creator and His unchangeable creative-formative decree.) Perverted, nonsensical forms were and are used to mirror the evolutionist view of the world as chaos (the word "perverted" is meaningless in that world view because evolutionism has no norms). When modern sculptors produce conglomerates of rusty metal scraps resembling nothing so much as junk heaps, they express the shabby, final and irredeemable ultimate disintegration in hell (while Vrubel could still hint at hell's writhing rebellion and despair in the person of Satan).

The visual arts proceeded from pointillism through symbolism, cubism and dadaism to the "post-modernism" of the 1960s, 70s and 80s. In this final stage anything goes in an inclusive pluralism of abstract expressionism, color field painting, pop art and minimalism. In music a parallel preoccupation with form for form's sake has brought us atonality, obsessive experimentation with novel sounds and instruments, and the twin opposites of sheer percussion or else total silence (as with John Cage).

Some of the technical innovations in art and music can doubtless be useful to those artists and composers today who are open to God's creative vision, for mere return to the forms of the earlier past is impossible and fruitless. Present creativity (again, Christ's wineskin parable) must always break past molds. In and for all times we must "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good" (I Thessalonians 5:21) in giving form to our creative vision.

The forms of commercial and functional art, literature and music have not

followed avant-garde "museum" or "academic" art all the way into the "post-modernist" wilderness because these forms have always had to reflect as it were a second- or third-hand creative vision — the comfort, entertainment and taste of practical existence-oriented common people. The patronizing contempt usually heaped by academics and critics upon these "consumers" and the mass production art catering to them is not wholly deserved, for commercial and functional art still implies *meaning* for man and his world. The trouble with commercial and functional art is, of course, that it cannot by its very nature break new ground or give new life to the arts and must be preoccupied with form at the expense of vision. In addition, that which is at first restricted to a few avant-garde artists and critics will eventually infiltrate commercial and functional art as well. The anti-creation, evolutionist-relativist, visionless and increasingly formless sculptures and canvasses of post-modernism may not yet decorate our living rooms, but they do depress our eyes and hearts in more and more bank foyers, doctors' waiting rooms and airport lounges.

However, all forms without vision must die in the end, returning to the dust from which they were taken even as did Adam's body. "Post-Darwinist" art, like Darwinist evolutionism which spawned it, has reached the nadir of expression and the end of its tether. Our Lord has raised up the modern biblical creation movement to restore creative vision and forms to His people so He might again be all in all (I Corinthians 15:28) not only in our natural sciences but also in our "humanities," the creative arts.

For further reading:

Jacques Barzun, *Classic, Romantic and Modern*. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1943, 1961.
James H. Billington, *The Icon and the Axe. An Interpretive History of Russian Culture*, especially Section VI. New York: Random House Vintage Books, Sept. 1970.
Dorothy L. Sayers, *The Mind of the Maker*, especially Chapter X, "Scalene Trinities." Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1941, 1968.
Any writings on the arts by Francis Schaeffer.

Footnotes

(continued from page 31)

³⁸ Stephen Jay Gould, *Ontogeny and Phylogeny* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1977), pp. 77-78. See also Stephen Jay Gould, *The Mismeasure of Man* (New York: W.W. Norton Co., 1981).

³⁹ Frank R. Zindler, "An Acorn Is Not an Oak Tree," *American Atheist*, August 1985, p. 29.

⁴⁰ Hitler, p. 17.

⁴¹ Rudolf Hoess, *Commandant of Auschwitz* (Cleveland: World Publishing Co., 1960).

⁴² Keith, p. 72.

⁴³ Quoted in George Mosse, *Nazi Culture* (New York: Schocken Books, 1966), p. 224.

The Influence of Evolution on Nazi Race Programs

Jerry Bergman

Evolution's influence on Nazism is a highly emotional topic which has been researched and discussed to only a limited extent. Contemporary documents conclusively demonstrate that Nazi governmental policy was highly influenced by evolutionist thought, the zeitgeist of both science and educated society of the time.¹ Their treatment of Jews and other "inferior" groups was largely a result of strong belief in biological evolution as the means to improve humankind.

The Nazis first tried to achieve this goal by isolating the "inferior races" to prevent them from further contaminating the "Aryan" gene pool.² It was widely believed that it was scientifically proven that the Jews and certain other races were genetically inferior. The government was simply trying to apply this science to produce a superior race of humans as part of their goal of a better society. Hitler's writings reveal that he viewed humankind as "animals," to whom principles learned from animal breeding can be applied. As Clark³ concluded:

Adolf Hitler's mind was captivated by evolutionary teaching — probably since the time he was a boy. Evolutionary ideas — quite undisguised — lie at the basis of all that is worst in *Mein Kampf* — and in his public speeches . . . Hitler reasoned . . . that a higher race would always conquer a lower.

Gasman⁴ stated that:

In no other country . . . did the ideas of Darwinism develop as . . . the total explanation of the world as in Germany . . . Insisting on the literal transfer of the laws of biology [as interpreted by evolution] to the social realm.

Hitler noted that one would not let a 2 million Mark thoroughbred horse breed with a nag. He likewise felt that to advance the human race we must "direct evolution" instead of letting natural forces and chance blindly produce.⁵ His view on race and evolution made the fatal combination which produced the holocaust. As Smith⁶ notes:

One of the central planks in Nazi theory and doctrine was . . . evolutionary theory [and] . . . that all biology had evolved . . . upward, and that . . . less evolved types . . . should be actively eradicated [and] . . . that natural selection could and should be actively *aided*, and therefore instituted political measures to eradicate . . . Jews, and . . . blacks, whom they considered . . . "under-developed."

And the belief that evolution can be directed to produce a "superior race," as Tenenbaum⁷ noted, was the central leitmotif of Nazism:

Each revolution has its own characteristic symbolism. The archsymbol of the Nazi creed was race. There were many other sources from which

Jerry Bergman receives his mail at 1306 N. Orleans, Bowling Green, OH 43202.

Nazism drew its ideological fire-water. But in that concatenation of ideas . . . and nightmares which made up the Nazi race concept, most of the other leitmotifs of Hitlerism were merged in a deadly harmony. The . . . social policies of the Nazi state, and to a considerable extent its military and diplomatic policies as well, can be most clearly comprehended in the light of its vast racial program.

Hitler often used the terms "superior race," "race contamination," and "pollution of the race," and the philosophy that humans could direct evolution up to a higher level is repeatedly reflected in his writings and speeches. To accomplish this goal required "barbarian behavior." Rauschning⁸ quoted Hitler as stating that the Nazis "are barbarians! We want to be barbarians. It is an honorable title. We shall rejuvenate the world . . ." Thus Keith⁹ concluded that Hitler:

. . . is an evolutionist; he has consciously sought to make the practice of Germany conform to the theory of evolution.

Many of Hitler's top aides held similar beliefs. Hoess, while still a young man, joined the Freikorps, a pre-Nazi German "secret night court" which often took the law into their own hands. After taking part in a brutal execution of a "traitor," Hoess was arrested and sentenced by the Republican German Court to 10 years hard labor. While in prison, Rudorff¹⁰ noted that the future Nazi was "particularly interested in books on 'racial' theories, heredity and ethnological works."

Hoess later used his knowledge about race to manage various concentration camps, including Auschwitz. He restructured this forced labor "camp" to a means of furthering evolution. In Auschwitz, the inmates were "No longer persons . . . [but] simply goods to be processed in the gigantic death-factory he had organized."¹¹

The Nazi Party did not view itself as wrong or inhumane.¹² It openly "prided itself on its scientific ideology and modern view of the world."¹³ Barzun¹⁴ notes that their "ideas of class and race . . . and determinism, reinforced as they are by our faith in . . . evolution, may well [be] . . . inescapable."

Darwinism and Racism

The teachings of evolution influenced Hitler in many ways. The complete title of Darwin's famous Bible was *The Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection or the Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*. Darwin himself, as the title noted, clearly believed that some races (such as blacks) were inferior to others. As Haller¹⁵ noted: "The subject of race inferiority was beyond critical reach in the late nineteenth century." Although Darwin opposed slavery, he did feel that one of the strongest evidences for evolution was the existence of living "primitive races," which he believed were evolutionarily in between humans and monkeys. The missing link wasn't missing but, most evolutionists of the time concluded, lived in Australia and other far-off places.¹⁶ Some living races were viewed as clear evidence of a graduation of living creatures pointing to the truth of evolution. For this reason, almost all biology textbooks of the time discuss the hierarchy of races. Although Darwin was far less racist than many of his disciples, especially Spencer, Haeckel, Hooton, Pearson, and Huxley, his theory provided the basis for the later extreme racism, and he never worked against this conclusion (see his Chapter 7, "On the Races of Man" in *The Descent of Man*). Ernst Haeckel is

actually called "the great ancestor of theoreticians of Nazi biology."¹⁷

The widely used textbook, *A Civic Biology*, which Scopes used in the class he taught in 1925 which became the basis for the famous Dayton, Tennessee *Scopes Trial*, discussed "man's place in nature." Under the section of evolution, in a mild, but openly racist statement it concludes that

At the present time there exist upon the earth five races . . . each very different from the other in instincts, social customs and . . . structure. These are the Ethiopian or negro type, . . . the Mongoloid or yellow race, . . . and finally, the highest type of all, Caucasians, represented by the civilized white inhabitants of Europe and America.¹⁸

This American high school textbook, which went through several editions, is mild compared to others of the time. The philosophical orientation that existed in the western world, especially Nazi Germany, is still clearly evident.

The man whom some regard as the actual modern "discoverer" of evolution by natural selection, Wallace, espoused essentially the same idea. In his words the "self-acting process [of the weak dying] would necessarily *improve the race* because in every generation the inferior would inevitably be killed off and the superior would remain — that is, *the fittest would survive*."¹⁹ This is the essence of evolution, and racism is at its core.

Even Chambers in his classic *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* to which Darwin said, that without this book he might never have written *The Origin of Species*, concluded that "the Negro" was "at the foot of" the Mongol, the Yellow race in between, and Caucasians at the top.²⁰ Chambers himself concluded the "various races of mankind, are simply . . . stages in the development of the highest or Caucasian type . . ." Chambers taught that the Black race is the least developed, advanced, or evolved, and the Caucasian race the highest, most advanced and most evolved race.²¹

Evolution in Nazi Germany and War

Extensive research into the existing documents has recently thrown much light on the influence of Darwin on Hitler and the Nazi ideology. The concept that "all men are created equal" and the egalitarian ideal which has dominated the American ideology for the past 20 years, and to a lesser degree since the founding of our country, is not universal among nations or cultures.²² The Germans specifically taught that they were a superior race, and thus it was best for all that they ruled.²³ As Tenenbaum noted:

the political philosophy of the Prussian, then the German State, was built on the ideas of struggle, selection, and survival of the fittest, all notions and observations arrived at later on by Darwin . . . but already in luxuriant bud in the German social philosophy of the nineteenth century, which culminated in Hegel's political philosophy of the State. Thus developed the doctrine of Germany's inherent right to rule the world on the basis of superior strength . . . of a "hammer and anvil" relationship between the Reich and the weaker nations.²⁴

The inequality doctrine was thus an integral part of German philosophy. As a race, they were superior to others, thus had a right based on evolution to subjugate others. Tenebaum concluded the Nazis

incorporated the . . . theory of evolution in their political system, with nothing left out, neither bone nor hide. Their political dictionary was replete with words like space, struggle, selection, and extinction

(Ausmerzen). The syllogism of their logic was clearly stated: The world is a jungle in which different nations struggle for space. The stronger win, the weaker die or are killed.²⁵

In the 1933 Nuremberg party rally, Hitler proclaimed that "a higher race subjects to itself a lower race and thus establishes a relationship which now embraces races of an unequal value. There thus results the subjection of a people under the will [of the higher race]. . . a right which we see in nature and which can be regarded as the sole conceivable right because [it was] founded on reason [of evolution]."²⁶

It is now well-known that Hitler openly intended to produce a superior race and relied heavily upon Darwin and Darwinian thought in both his social and extermination policies. Nazi Germany actually glorified war as it was a means of killing the less fit. War was actually necessary to "upgrade the race." Clark concludes, quoting extensively from *Mein Kampf*, that:

Hitler's attitude to the League of Nations and to peace and war were based upon the same principles. "A world court . . . would be a joke . . . the whole world of Nature is a mighty struggle between strength and weakness — an eternal victory of the strong over the weak. There would be nothing but decay in the whole of nature if this were not so. States which should offend against this elementary law would fall into decay." In those early days Hitler himself was alarmed to see signs of such decay in the German nation . . . (Speech at Munich, 1923). "He who would live must fight. He who does not wish to fight in this world where permanent struggle is the law of life, has not the right to exist" To think otherwise is to "insult" nature. "Distress, misery and disease are her rejoinders" (*Mein Kampf*).²⁷

Although for generations Germans were war oriented, Hitler and others added a new justification, namely, that war was a positive force because it eliminated both the weaker races and the weaker members of the superior race. Remember that Darwin believed that this was the process that caused development of a higher race. Hitler stressed that the Germans were a great people primarily because they are warlike and thereby continually eliminate the weaker among them. This view was expressed well by Wiggan who openly states that the process of eradication of the weaker races is a major source of evolution:

At one time man had scarcely more brains than his anthropoid cousins, the apes. But, by kicking, biting, fighting . . . and outwitting his enemies and by the fact that the ones who had not sense and strength enough to do this were killed off, man's brain became enormous and he waxed both in wisdom and agility, if not in size . . .²⁸

War is thus good, for only by . . . "kicking, fighting, biting, etc.," do humans evolve. They are positive, even to the extent of claiming the contradiction that human civilization would not exist if it were not for constant fighting. Hitler concluded that Europe as a whole evolved more than other civilizations primarily because of its constant fighting. (This commonly believed assumption is not true; many tribes in Africa were historically continually involved in wars, as were most countries in Asia and America. War was actually typical of all peoples, except those who lived in very cold climates near the poles, or on small islands that had abundant food.)²⁹

Nazi policies therefore resulted not so much from a "hatred" toward Jewish

and other peoples (a few statements in his writing could actually be interpreted as laudatory of Jews) but more from idealistic, evolutionary goals.³⁰ Hitler once said if it were not for certain Jews, the Nazis would not have gained power. His major policy concern seemed to be their "polluting the race." Hitler elaborated as follows:

. . . many Jews are not aware of the destructive power they represent. Now he who destroys life is himself risking death. That is the secret of what's happening to the Jews. Whose fault is it when a cat devours a mouse . . .?

. . . the Jews [are] . . . the ferment that causes people to decay . . . In the long run nature eliminates the noxious elements. One may be repelled by this law of nature which demands that all living things should mutually devour one another. The fly is snapped up by a dragon-fly, which itself is swallowed by the bird, which itself falls victim to a larger bird.

. . . it's useful to know the laws of nature — for that enables us to obey them. To act otherwise would be to rise in revolt against . . . [the natural order of things].³¹

Hitler here stressed that we must understand and apply the "laws of nature," one of which is the "survival of the fittest" law, for the human races' benefit. We should, as a race, take part in the elimination, or at least the quarantine, of the less fit. He adds:

If I can accept a living Commandment, it is this one: "Thou shall preserve the species." The life of the individual must not be set at too high a price. If the individual were important in the eyes of nature, nature would take care to preserve him. Among the millions of eggs a fly lays, very few are hatched out — and yet the race of flies thrives.³²

Individuals, Hitler stressed, are not important. The important thing is the race.³³ And certain races, as Whitehead notes, were not even persons,

The Jews, labeled subhumans, became nonbeings. It was both legal and right to exterminate them in the collectivist and evolutionist viewpoint. They were not considered part of the whole and thus were not persons in the sight of the German government.³⁴

Hickman adds that:

It is perhaps no coincidence that Adolf Hitler was a firm believer in and preacher of evolutionism. Whatever the deeper, profound, complexities of his psychosis, it is certain that [the concept of struggle was important for]. . . his book, *Mein Kampf*, clearly set forth a number of evolutionary ideas, particularly those emphasizing struggle, survival of the fittest and extermination of the weak to produce a better society.³⁵

He was especially concerned with the effects of cross-breeding with Germans, whom he felt to be part of the Aryan race, the superior race, with supposedly non-Aryans (Semitics and Blacks were only two among the many inferior races). His ploy to exterminate the Jews was based heavily upon Darwinian thought and philosophy. One of his main concerns in achieving the "final solution" was to reduce contamination of the Aryan gene pool, something for which he felt future generations (once the inferior races were exterminated) would thank him profusely. Thus Clark concludes:

The Germans were the higher race, destined for a glorious evolutionary future. For this reason it was essential that the Jews should be

segregated, otherwise mixed marriages would take place. Were this to happen, all nature's efforts "to establish an evolutionary higher stage of being may thus be rendered futile" (*Mein Kampf*).³⁶

The Media Today and Evolution's Influence in Germany

For several reasons, therefore, Darwinian evolution was championed in Germany more than most other parts of the world. At the 1863 National Conference of German Scientists, Ernest Haeckel of the University of Jena, one of its leading proponents, supporters and writers, forcefully presented his views and began four decades as "Darwin's chief apostle." He was especially active in writing about "social Darwinism," or the application of Darwinian theory to explain the historical and social development of civilization, and why some were advanced, others primitive.³⁷ But, as Gould concluded:

. . . Haeckel's greatest influence was, ultimately, in another, tragic direction — national socialism [Nazism]. His evolutionary racism; his call to the German people for racial purity and unflinching devotion to . . . his belief that harsh, inexorable laws of evolution ruled human civilization and nature alike, conferring upon favored races the right to dominate others . . . his brave words about objective science — all contributed to the rise of Nazism. The Monist League that he had founded and led . . . made a comfortable transition to active support for Hitler.³⁸

In spite of this evidence, the influence of Darwinian evolution on the holocaust has been greatly downplayed by the mass media. It was clearly present, and a review of the literature indicates that the racism of Germany would have had a difficult time existing in Europe if New Testament creationism void of curse theories had been widely accepted.

Nazism and Religion

Some persons, noting that Germany was a "very religious country," claim that Hitler was at one time an altar boy for a short while and "considered himself a good Roman Catholic."³⁹ The strong feelings of Hitler and the Nazi party against religion as a whole, though, are very clear. Hitler stated bluntly:

The organized lie [religion] must be smashed. The State must remain the absolute master. When I was younger, I thought it was necessary to set about [destroying religion] with dynamite. I since then realized there's room for subtlety. The rotten branch falls of itself. The final state must be, in St. Peter's Chair a senile officiant; facing him a few sinister old women, as gaga and as poor in spirit as anyone could wish. The young and healthy are on our side . . . It's impossible eternally to hold humanity in bondage and lies . . . [It] was only between the sixth and eighth centuries that Christianity was imposed upon our people . . . Our peoples had previously succeeded in living all right without this religion. I have six divisions of SS men absolutely indifferent in matters of religion. It doesn't prevent them from going to their death with serenity in their souls.⁴⁰

Hitler's beliefs here are abundantly clear. The younger people, he stressed, were the hope of Germany because they were "absolutely indifferent in the matters of religion." As Keith noted, he also viewed evolution and Christianity as polar opposites:⁴¹

Christianity makes no distinction of race or of color; it seeks to break

down all racial barriers. In this respect the hand of Christianity is against that of Nature, for are not the races of mankind the evolutionary harvest which Nature has toiled through long ages to produce? May we not say, then, that Christianity is anti-evolutionary in its aim?⁴²

Borman was equally blunt, stressing that the churches' opposition to evolution and science forces it to be condemned; in his words:

National Socialist [Nazi] and Christian concepts are incompatible. The Christian Churches build upon the ignorance of men and strive to keep large portions of the people in ignorance because only in this way can the Christian Churches maintain their power. On the other hand, national Socialism is based on scientific foundations. Christianity's immutable principles, which were laid down almost two thousand years ago, have increasingly stiffened into life-alien dogmas. National Socialism, however, if it wants to fulfill its task further, must always guide itself according to the newest data of scientific researches. The Christian Churches have long been aware that exact scientific knowledge poses a threat to their existence. Therefore, by means of such pseudo-sciences as theology, they take great pains to suppress or falsify scientific research. Our National Socialist world view stands on a much higher level than the concepts of Christianity, which in their essentials were taken over from Judaism. For this reason, too, we can do without Christianity.⁴³

Conclusion

The evidence is very clear that Darwinian ideas had a tremendous impact in German thought and practice. It was also a thoroughly secular movement, relying on science and the positivistic movement, even though Germany as a nation had been the leader of the Protestant reformation. Darwinian ideas had a tremendous influence on causing World War II, the loss of 40 million lives and the waste of about 6 trillion 1945 dollars. Firmly convinced that evolution was true, Hitler saw himself as the modern saviour of mankind. He felt that the world would thank him someday for his "scientific socialism" programs. By breeding a superior race, the world would look upon him as the man who pulled humanity up to a higher level of evolution.

FOOTNOTES

- ¹ John Haller, *Outcasts from Evolution: Scientific Attitudes of Racial Inferiority* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1971).
- ² Leon Poliakov, *The Aryan Myth* (New York: Basic Books, 1974). Translated by Edmund Howard.
- ³ Robert Clark, *Darwin: Before and After* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1953), p. 115.
- ⁴ Daniel Gasman, *The Scientific Origin of National Socialism* (New York: American Elsevier, 1971), p. xiii.
- ⁵ *Ibid.*
- ⁶ Beate Wilder-Smith, *The Day Nazi Germany Died* (San Diego, CA: Master Books, 1982), p. 27.
- ⁷ Joseph Tenenbaum, *Race and Reich* (New York: Twayne Pub., 1956), p. vii.
- ⁸ Hermann Rauschning, *The Revolution of Nihilism* (New York: Alliance Book Co., 1939).

⁹ Arthur Keith, *Evolution and Ethics* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1946), p. 230.

¹⁰ Raymond Rudorff, *Studies in Ferocity* (New York: The Citadel Press, 1969), p. 236.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 240.

¹² Bruno Bettelheim, *The Informed Heart* (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1960).

¹³ Gasman, pp. iv-xv.

¹⁴ Jacques Barzun, *Darwin, Marx, Wagner* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1958), p. xx.

¹⁵ Mark H. Haller, *Eugenics: Hereditarian Attitudes in American Thought* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1963), p. 132.

¹⁶ M.W. de Laubenfels, *Pageant of Life Science* (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1949).

¹⁷ Poliakov, p. 284.

¹⁸ George William Hunter, *A Civic Biology* (New York: American Book Co., 1914), p. 196.

¹⁹ Henshaw Ward, *Charles Darwin: The Man and His Warfare*, (New York: The Bobbs Merrill Co., 1927), p. 288.

²⁰ F.G. Crookshank, *The Mongol In our Midst* (New York: E.P. Dutton Co., 1924), p. 1.

²¹ Robert Chambers, *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation*. Reprint by Leicester University Press, 1969 (original 1844), p. 7.

²² Ethel Tobach et al., *The Four Horsemen: Racism, Sexism, Militarism and Social Darwinism* (New York: Behavioral Publications, 1974).

²³ Clark, p. 115.

²⁴ Tenenbaum, p. 211.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 211-212.

²⁶ Nuremberg Trial Transcript, Vol. 4, p. 279.

²⁷ Clark, pp. 115-116.

²⁸ Albert Edward Wiggin, *The New Dialogue of Science* (Garden City, NY: Garden City Publishing Co., 1922), p. 102.

²⁹ Jerry Bergman, "A Short History of Wars and Holocausts." Paper submitted for publication, 1984.

³⁰ Karl Schleunes, *The Twisted Road to Auschwitz* (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1970).

³¹ Adolf Hitler, *Hitler's Secret Conversations* (New York: Farrar, Strauss & Young, 1953). Translated by Norman Cameron and R.H. Stevens, pp. 115-116.

³² *Ibid.*, p. 116.

³³ Joachim Fest, *Hitler* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1974). Translated by Richard and Clara Winston.

³⁴ John Whitehead, *The Stealing of America* (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1983), p. 15.

³⁵ Richard Hickman, *Biocreation*. In press, 1985, pp. 51-52.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

³⁷ Frederic Wertham, *A Sign for Cain* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966).

(continued on page 23)

Ephesians One, Four

Randall C. Sherman

What was it like to be the one
Who formed the earth and made the sun?
What was it like in that great hour?
What was it like to wield such power?

Before He spoke no force could be
But by His word and majesty.
He lit the sky and spake the sea.
He breathed the breath of life in me.

He is the king of righteousness.
With great perfection did He this.
Creating boundless untold care,
He wrought in providence with flair.

His mind was set upon this task.
No wavering — He wasn't rash.
He weighed it fully — counting costs.
He knew the consequence and loss.

What agony He chose to bear,
And no one else that load to share.
He knew our choice would lead to sin,
And, Oh, what grief would enter in!

What awful conquests death would gain,
What torment too for those not slain,
And all, but God, asked not to be.
'Tis He who called to misery.

So this is why He wove His word
In all of life that we observe —
That we, to live, would have to see
His truth and love and purity.

And in the time when he began
To form the worlds within His hand,
Christ was as good as on the tree,
Choosing death as he chose me.

Randall C. Sherman receives his mail at Box 6516, APO San Francisco 96519.

Clip and mail to: CREATION SOCIAL SCIENCE
AND HUMANITIES SOCIETY
1429 N. Holyoke
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Enclosed is my payment of \$12* for Sustaining Membership dues. I subscribe to the Creation Social Science and Humanities Society's **Statement of Belief**:

1. The Bible is the written Word of God. It is inspired and inerrant throughout. Its assertions are historically and scientifically true in all the original autographs. To the student of the social sciences and humanities this means that the account of origins in Genesis is a factual presentation of simple historical truths.
2. All basic types of living things, including man, were made by direct creative acts of God during the Creation Week described in Genesis. Whatever biological changes have occurred since Creation Week have accomplished only changes within the original created kinds.
3. The great Flood described in Genesis, commonly referred to as the Noachian Flood, was an historic event worldwide in its extent and effect.
4. We are an organization of Christian men and women who accept Jesus Christ as our Lord and Saviour. The account of the special creation of Adam and Eve as one man and woman in the image of God and their subsequent fall into sin is the basis for our belief in the necessity of a Saviour for all mankind. Therefore, salvation can come only through accepting Jesus Christ as our Saviour.

Date: _____

Signature: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State _____ ZIP _____

*(\$13 U.S. if you reside outside the USA).

Enclosed is non-member subscription fee of \$14 (foreign, \$15 U.S.) for one year's subscription to the **CSSH Quarterly** (to run through September 1987).

Mail to:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____

State _____ Zip _____

EDITORIAL	page 1
LETTERS AND COMMENTS	page 2
ANNOUNCEMENTS	page 2
<i>Paper on Weaknesses in Evolutionist Explanation of Origins</i>	
<i>Creationism Resource Information</i>	
<i>Christian Wilderness Association</i>	
A MEDITATION	page 4
<i>Cardinal Newman</i>	
<i>Calligraphy by Douglas S. Gerhardt</i>	
MY YOKE IS EASY	page 5
<i>Mary Tenbrink</i>	
MAGIC SELF-DEIFICATION AND THE EVERLASTING GOSPEL	page 6
<i>Ellen Myers</i>	
COMPUTER INITIALIZED	page 12
<i>Alice Bostrom</i>	
GOD THE "CREATOR" — MAN "THE ARTIST" CREATED IN HIS IMAGE	page 13
<i>Margaret Stucki</i>	
CREATIVE "FORMS" IN THE BIBLICAL CREATION PERSPECTIVE	page 19
<i>Ellen Myers</i>	
THE INFLUENCE OF EVOLUTION ON NAZI RACE PROGRAMS	page 24
<i>Jerry Bergman</i>	
EPHESIANS ONE, FOUR	page 32
<i>Randall C. Sherman</i>	

Creation Social Science
& Humanities Society
1429 N. Holyoke (316) 683-3610
Wichita, Kansas 67208

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Wichita, Kansas
Permit No. 929

MO ASSN FOR CREATION
2111 PRINCETON PLACE
ST LOUIS

MO 63117